

CANDOUR

*The British
Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLII Nos 7 & 8

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

July/August 1990

The A.B.C. of Politics

DEMOCRACY IS THE DEVIL - LET HIM HAVE IT!

by Rosine de Bounevialle

SOME years ago, John Tyndall was asked on television if he believed in Democracy. If the query had been phrased in Latin, it was evident that the questioner would have used the form which expects the answer "No". As the interview was conducted in what presently passes for English the interviewer had to rely on a sceptical tone of voice. Mr Tyndall, nothing disconcerted, replied that of course no government is possible without the overall consent of the great majority of the governed. In that sense he did believe in democracy. That commonsense reply resulted in the subject being abandoned for the rest of the interview which was, alas, only too predictable in these days when people's "freedom of speech" fluctuates dramatically in tune with the media notion of the "respectability" of the member of the demos in question.

Invention of Satan

Blasphemers, pornographers, murderers, thieves and vagabonds are all welcome to "air" their views in the names of liberty, equality and fraternity - those being the democratic ideals that fathered the bloody Terror organised by Robespierre and St Just and its even bloodier offsprings reared by "the will of the people" from Manhattan to Moscow, from San Francisco to Saigon. But let one unenlightened patriot among the demos raise his voice to condemn Democracy for the damnable (and damned) invention of Satan that it is, and the air vent is suddenly stopped. Communication is confined to the level of the strings and tins of our childhood attempts at telephony. The dominant sound bounced from satellite to satellite is the age-old howl induced by the Priests and Elders of the Temple: "Away with him," "Crucify him." The modern equivalent of that sentiment is: "Away with fascist beasts," echoed by multitudes every bit as reasonably managed and deluded as the one gathered before that vacillating time-server Pontius Pilate during the most famous mis-trial in history (though the performance at Nuremburg ran it as close a carbon copy except that no Witness to the Truth was present on the later occasion).

That mob screaming for the blood of the Innocent only a few days before had been a joyful crowd acclaiming that same Innocent as their promised King and Saviour. How were they so easily persuaded to the opposite view? Why, "the Priests and Elders went among them" extolling the advantages of choosing a robber so successfully that against all legality, justice, compassion and integrity they chose Barabbas. Democracy had reduced the chosen people of God to an unthinking rabble who acknowledged no king but Caesar. Whence Caesar also was reduced to the dimensions of the feeble Governor of Judea ceremoniously washing his hands of the crime he had agreed with "the majority" to commit.

Democracy has done no less for us. The first democrat was Lucifer - not a "deprived" person lacking love and care but the very brightest creature in an harmonious hierarchy, only not quite bright enough to know that Heaven is unique. He fancied setting up his own establishment - Liberty. That made God redundant - Equality. So the masterless angel, having made Hell for himself and his followers, has busied himself ever since persuading mankind to join him in that state - Fraternity. He does not have to be an imaginative innovator in his sales talk. The same old lie serves to cripple the same Old Adam. All our so-called modern democratic methods are not variations on the original theme - they are the original theme, only the tempo is much slower since the Fabian enthusiasm for the inevitability of gradualness.

We should recognise the technique: it has been employed against our laws and institutions often enough. We do not have to go back two thousand years to recall it. The first key to the successful operation of Democracy is the abrogation of any restraining law - in our case, the Common Law of England, inspired by God and assented to by every subject under its protection. The next is the elimination by death or imprisonment of the personal embodiment of the law, be he judge or monarch. The last requirement is a brainwashed populace which will then accept its servile state as safe and normal. Our Common Law and our Constitution so rooted in it, are buried beneath such a range of nullifying expedencies as to be as invisible as a neglected grave. Though we still have a monarch, she is bound and gagged so tightly with synthetic conventions and human respect that she cannot even answer petitions from patriots wise enough to know they are desperate. We have no king but Ombudsman!

"They Went Amongst Us"

But surely not all our Priests and Rulers are corrupt. Oh no, we have a number of moderates. So did the Sanhedrin - one of them provided a sepulchre for truth. As to the brainwashed public: when confronted with the unmistakable treason of the European Community, even the be-spoke B.B.C. could not produce a favourable vote until we were all gathered in the Referendum forum where the High Priests and Elders "went amongst us" extolling the virtues of the robber - and against all loyalty, justice, integrity and even commonsense we too chose Barabbas. After twenty-two years brooding over Northern Ireland and four hundred years over usury, "they went amongst us" until we didn't know a traitor from a loyal subject; a debt from a credit; order from chaos. Oh yes, "they went amongst us."

No conference is complete without these flitting birds heralding the approach of the tiger ready to take the next bite of every nation's sovereignty. Cohn-Bendit, the prophet of "perpetual revolution" to Belfast; Burns of the "American" Federal Reserve to London and Basle; Kissinger to all stations from Peking to Pretoria; all fixing fresh shackles on the victims of "world democratic opinion". Every student of current affairs has marked their passage and yet, in the unlikely event of the Brain of Britain being asked what these plenipotentiaries have in common apart from globe-jetting at taxpayers' expense, he would hesitate to reply for fear of the Public Order Act!

There was a time when the British, and not only the British, were proud to call themselves subjects of the Crown because such subjection

made them free under the Common Law. Even the eighteenth century rebellious Americans, though determined on founding a Republic, thought that law so admirable that they based their own Constitution on it. Now both written and unwritten Constitutions are in tatters. Patriots in both countries are concerned to piece them together again. Don Bell writes that when he left his native America in 1926 it was a Republic, but when he returned thirty-seven years later it had degenerated into a Democracy. Now it is said, democratically speaking, that the height of our ambition is to achieve citizenship of a godless world where we shall all be as Moderate-for-Truth as is compatible with human respect.

Patriots, however, have no such sorry outlook. We have seen that Democracy corrupts, and Parliamentary Democracy corrupts absolutely. Corruption is the best evidence that death is an accomplished fact. When we lose our fascination for re-arranging the ruins and bend our efforts to removing the rabble, we can uncover the ancient foundations and build our State anew with native stone. Let the Devil take Democracy - when we recover our own Monarch, our own money, our own law and our own land, we shall be happy to be British subjects of our once and future Sovereign.

HOBSON'S VOTE

The frying-pan is hardly
A place to sit content!
Like edicts from the Tory
So-painful-government,
But come the next election
The choice would be "the fire"
With Socialist consuming
Our Sovereignty entire.
Chameleons and chancers,
A leader who salutes
With raised clench-fist, a power,
Alien in aims and roots;
Where rubber-tyred necklace
Is gifted and set-fire
On those who have misfortune
To gain the donor's ire.
Such pals are so deserving
The cuddle and the hug
From Labour's would-be-mighty,
Uncritical of thug.
The Rose they pinched to soften
Their Red Flag's bloody past
And on their list of "comrades"
True Brits, as per, come last!
So rail against the Poll Tax,
Usurious device,
But with becoming shyness
Do not be bitten twice.

"END-OF-THE-CENTURY" BLUES

Let's overcrowd the Island
Dilute the Christian code,
Reverse the Bible strictures
Make sodomy the mode.
The patriot, the pilgrim,
The unborn babe to quell;
With Sappho-style for ladies
To ease the way to Hell.
Let royals talk of "greenhouse"
And monstrous architect
Purblind to sovereign sell-out
And "race" made disrespect.

Let's use spray more carefully
Within the smallest room,
The ozone has been punctured,
These droplets spell our doom;
The squirt to erase an odour
Would melt the Polar cap
Yet bombs in Space for testing
Bring no such dire mishap?
O lack-a-day and woe, woe
The circuses and bread
The policy's "Diversion",
Governing's watershed.

B.E. BIGGS

Read OPEN SESAME, an anthology of the poems of B.E. Biggs, for apt comment on the times in which we live. Available now for only £1 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

Forest House Liss Forest Hampshire GU33 7DD.

DOES CHINA WANT DEMOCRACY?

by Noel Hunt

"BRETHREN, I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken." [Oliver Cromwell to the Kirk of Scotland, 1650]

*

AS used in the West "democracy" is political-speak for universal suffrage, one-man-one-vote or OMOV as it is called in the subversive business. This is not democracy at all. Rather, it is ochlocracy or mob rule or, perhaps better, kakistocracy or rule by the worst. It is this political gimmick which the West insists on forcing upon countries throughout the world. Only "democracy", we are always told, can cure the ills from which any given country suffers. This is a surprising attitude, since the evidence is that "democracy" does nothing at all to cure any political problems. In fact, it is probably true to say that no political theory, not even socialism, has brought as much suffering in its wake as has "democracy".

The evidence tells us that a group of kindred peoples inhabiting the north of Europe and the British Isles have, against all probability, succeeded in making "democracy" work. From it they have evolved what is known as the Westminster system of government. In this society, so long as it remained homogeneous, the introduction of universal suffrage somehow gave both political stability and material advance. But this has not proved to be the case with any of the other societies which have adopted "democracy". For instance, "democracy" was imposed upon India. This gave rise to such corruption and inefficiency that even other Third World countries noticed it. The same is true of South America. It is equally true of Africa.

Smoke And Smother In Tiananmen Square

Yet, undeterred by the failure of "democracy" almost everywhere, our politicians and our media continue to call for more and ever more applications of this political nostrum. For example, it is now held by everyone except realists that China not only would be the better for "democracy" but that she actually wants it as well. We are given the impression that suddenly China had begun to seek democracy, that she was making progress towards attaining it, but that she was frustrated by what it is now almost obligatory to call "the horror of Tiananmen Square".

Daily our television screens showed us crowds, described as "students", carrying placards in Chinese characters which we were told called for "democracy". Later the demonstrators obligingly began to write their placards in English. In other words, they were not addressing their government but viewers in the West. The media may have been right in calling the demonstrators "students", and in saying that the banners called "democracy". Perforce, we must take their word for it. For all we can tell the "students" might have been from the local Rent-a-Mob, the banners telling us that Blanco Washes Whiter! Only a cynic would suggest that media workers, like the rest of us, have accounts to pay and mortgages to meet, and that just like the rest of us they tend to do what the boss wants.

We know that the population of China is enormous. We know that a proportion of this huge number are students. We are told that some of these students were demonstrating and calling for "democracy". We do not actually know that the demonstrators were students, or that they spoke for anyone other than themselves. This is far from being proof that the bulk of the Chinese people want "democracy". For all we know to the contrary most Chinese, like most Westerners, believe that students should confine themselves to their studies and should keep out of politics.

It would be very odd indeed if a majority of the Chinese suddenly opted for universal suffrage and "democracy". The whole history of China - and it is a very long one - shows that Western "democracy" is alien and unacceptable. Western society regards the individual as all-important; China gives priority to the family. China has always been ruled by an Emperor or similarly exalted figure, in theory all-powerful. Administration has traditionally been carried on by a carefully selected elite of elderly mandarins. The Chinese system of government has always been a strongly conservative gerontocracy whose wide powers were tempered only by corruption and by inefficiency. That this system is admirably suited to the Chinese temperament is proved by its great age. To us it seems oppressive. It by no means follows that the Chinese think so.

Part of the ruling process in China has always been large-scale killings from time to time by the government. The country's rulers have never subscribed to the Western belief that human life is sacred, believing that periodically blood must be freely shed if order is to be preserved. The business of a government is to rule. The Chinese rulers showed last summer that they are determined to remain in control and we have no evidence to run counter to the country's history and tradition that this action has not been welcomed by the majority of their subjects.

When one considers the suffering, misery and oppression which the Western obsession with "democracy" has inflicted on so much of the globe, one can only hope that the Chinese will have enough sense to avoid "democracy" like the plague it has so often proved itself to be.

WISE WORDS ABOUT DEMOCRACY

"You can never have a revolution in order to establish a democracy. You must have a democracy in order to have a revolution." [G.K. Chesterton]

"The adoption of Democracy as a form of Government by all European nations is fatal to good government, to liberty, to law and order, to respect for authority and to religion, and must eventually produce a state of chaos from which a new world tyranny will arise."

[The Duke of Northumberland in History of World Revolution]

"Fear God and the stupidity of the populace." [Hilaire Belloc]

"Democracy is a kingless regime infested by many kings." [Mussolini]

These quotations are taken from **A TRADITIONALIST'S ANTHOLOGY** by Elizabeth, Lady Freeman, M.B.E. This collection of extracts from some of the wisdom of past and present ages is available from us for £10.

A POLITICAL DREAM

MANY years ago, as a teenager, I used to wonder why Members of Parliament could not all be independent, instead of having to belong to a party. There were, in fact, at that time about a dozen M.P.s, including representatives of the two older universities, who were labelled "Independent".

Just suppose that instead of owing allegiance to one party or another, all Members were free to vote on every issue as individuals. No more party whips, no more acrimonious exchanges between people merely because they belonged to different parties, no more time wasted in making party political points instead of dealing with the matter in hand. No more opinion polls, an idea which appeals to me particularly: I have always thought that these serve no purpose other than telling the parties how they are doing. They are harmful to the democratic principle, because they either persuade weak-minded or lazy people to go along with them or incite a few individualists to go the opposite way just to show 'em! They should not be allowed within some weeks of a general election. Exit polls are even more harmful and should be banned altogether.

To return to the idea of all M.P.s being Independents: it wouldn't work, of course. How could you form a government or an opposition if there were no party organisations to draw up manifestos? How could people enjoy speculation on the imminent downfall of a Prime Minister if there were no apparent successor in view? Fancy allowing a Premier a choice of all 650 Members when forming an administration! And what about finance? Where would the huge sums come from, which under the present system are provided by wealthy backers or trade union funds?

Too many problems arise - better to stay with present arrangements where, as W.S. Gilbert pointed out, M.P.s merely have to vote "just as their leaders tell 'em to"!

THE PARTY SYSTEM AND THE CORRUPTION OF PARLIAMENT

by the late BEN GREENE

A trenchant analysis of the revolution that has enabled the modern system of party politics to render meaningless our age-old principles of English law and government. Only £1, including U.K. postage, from Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

"THERE was great consternation in Berkhamstead when J.P. and former county councillor Mr Ben Greene was arrested under the special powers given to the Government whereby people concerned with any organisation likely to be affected by enemy agents could be arrested. Mr Greene, known as Big Ben because he was 6ft 8in high, was an active member of the Christian Council for the Settlement of Europe. Another group with which he was involved was the British People's Party, which had offices in Berkhamsted."

[Hemel Hempstead Gazette, May 1990]

THE LIFE OF BEN GREENE

by Leslie von Goetz (nee Greene)

BEN Greene was born in Brazil in 1901 to a reasonably wealthy family and only came to England when he was nine. The fact that English was not his first language and that he grew to the exceptional height of 6'8" combined to make him feel something of an outsider, even in his own family which included a lot of distinguished cousins such as Graham and Hugh Carleton Greene. As a result he thought deeply about the horrors of war and the injustices of society. He saw a great deal of the post-war world, doing famine relief work with the Society of Friends in Germany and the Soviet Union. He learned a lot about the reality of life in the latter country and never fell for the idealised picture. Equally he knew that the hypocrisy and wickedness had not been all on one side, either in the war or in the peace "settlement" after it, and he campaigned tirelessly for a better settlement which would be less likely to ensure the recurrence of war.

He joined the Labour Party in the interests of social justice but quickly learned that the very structure of the party, with the trade union block vote and the infiltration of Communists (in those days they were proscribed by the Labour Party), was unlikely to produce the sort of society he wanted, although he fought several constituencies in the Labour interest. When told that he was among those who would be elected to the Labour National Executive the day before the election was to take place, he refused to be a party to this kind of fraud which further strained his relations with the Labour leaders.

After The Kristallnacht

The treatment of the Jews in Germany was a matter of great international concern and Ben was sent out by the Quakers to investigate the situation as he spoke German like a native. The Dutch Prime Minister was threatening to close the frontier to Jewish refugees because of the strain they were putting on Dutch hospitality - the people who were getting out of Germany were the ones who had money and international connections, sponsorship, etc., and of course some of them turned out to be far better off than those who were scraping the barrel to offer them hospitality. In Germany Ben found the truly desperate, the ones who had lost everything and had no overseas connections.

With the help of the Red Cross, the Quakers, the Catholic and Protestant Churches and the governments concerned, a scheme was devised whereby internal relief could be given to the hardest cases inside Germany which would avoid the kind of embarrassment the Dutch had been suffering. The stumbling block, to Ben's enormous surprise, turned out to be Jews themselves. They would not agree because it meant foreign currency would be available to the Germans. This was International Finance with a vengeance! We have seen the same kind of thing in recent years in connection with South Africa, but the anti-apartheid fanatics are not usually black themselves but rather purist whites. In this case Ben could not persuade Rothschild to soften his stance. It was not that he did not believe the hardship stories Ben told him. He must have believed them for he phoned them through to Reuters in Ben's presence without checking them in any way. But then it was the same reply - no help could cross German frontiers.

The background to Ben Greene's war-time internment is rather complicated to explain in detail, and those who want to savour the truly scandalous nature of his treatment should read **The Man Who Was "M"** - the life of Maxwell Knight by Anthony Masters, published in 1984. In summary, the fact that he was a pacifist, determined to stop the war to the best of his ability, was actually travelling to Germany and had a lot of enemies among party politicians, led MI5 to the appalling procedure of setting out to frame him.

Under Regulation 18B it was possible to detain people indefinitely without trial under one or other of two headings - "being of hostile origin or associations and by reason thereof..." or "having recently been concerned in acts prejudicial to the safety of the state and by reason thereof..." The catch for MI5 was that the Home Secretary still had to have "reasonable cause to believe" that the person concerned fell in to one or the other category. So reasonable causes were concocted by informers and agents provocateur on a scale which would have certainly embarrassed Lord Liverpool's government! Although something over 1300 were detained under these regulations, only some 750 turned out to be followers of Mosley, yet in popular memory all detainees were Mosleyites and unquestioned traitors.

A Law Unto Itself

Ben Greene was the only person detained under 18B who ever received a list of the things he was alleged to have done to have justified his detention and the grudging statement that these charges were to be "regarded as withdrawn". After two years in prison, stripped of his magistracy, a general object of odium (except curiously enough to his successful Conservative opponents in Hull and Gravesend who stood up for him valiantly), Ben Greene assumed that an action for wrongful imprisonment could only be successful. After all, an informer had concocted lies about him, he had been imprisoned on the strength of these admitted lies, so surely he had been wrongfully imprisoned? Not so, as it turned out, according to British Law as passed by our wonderful democratic House of Commons.

He did not have to prove that he had been unjustly imprisoned - rather, he had to prove that the Home Secretary had acted unreasonably in accepting the unsworn statements of an enemy alien. To do this, it transpired, he needed access to all the correspondence and documents which the police had removed from him years before when he was arrested. By the constant tenor of his opposition to fascism, and steadfast pacifism, he could have shown there was an element of unreason in believing he had been acting to establish a Nazi government in Britain by force of arms. But he was not given access to his own documents to prove his case - Crown privilege was pleaded - the case was lost and, to the world, because he had lost his action for wrongful imprisonment he was not wrongfully imprisoned.

Even his own family thought him paranoid after in his sensitivity over this slur on his reputation - his conviction that people were bringing it up behind his back, doing him down in business deals, etc. But it turned out when Anthony Masters' book came out that he had not been paranoid after all. Knight had so resented the blighting of his own career by his wrongful behaviour in Greene's case becoming known that he continued to have him watched and to try to find grounds against him.

Ben worked for years on a study of the British Constitution and how it was corrupted by the party system. He could never find a publisher - some wanted it cut down, others lengthened, while bits of it became out of date and needed to be re-written. He never got around to what might have been an even greater work: a proper study of the old legal relationship of Master and Servant and how it should have been developed to meet the new industrial conditions, without developing the trade union tyranny which was so oppressive to those without the magic card as the employer's arbitrary right of dismissal. He wanted to work in the insights of the great papal encyclicals **Rerum Novarum** and **Quadragesimo Anno**, but it did not happen.

Eventually his work on the British Constitution was published in this journal and, as the advertisement on page six shows, it is now available from Candour Publishing Company in booklet form. Ben's articles for **Candour** may be confusing for they use "sovereignty" more or less as a term of abuse, while we are accustomed to cherishing our national sovereignty. The "sovereignty" of which Ben was writing critically was the alleged ability of the British Parliament to pass any law, however contrary to the law of God, the Natural Law, or the past laws of the land, and make it the law of the land. He constantly quoted Hartley Shawcross' statement that the power of the British Parliament was such that if it were to decree that all blue-eyed babies were to be strangled at birth, then carrying out that order would not be murder. [*]

The years of tragedy that have marked the retreat of empire and the establishment of "democratic self-government" over all the world have shown only too clearly how prophetically right Ben was in his condemnation of the party system allied to a "sovereign" parliament. Under this system there are no constraints to the tyranny of the majority. A tyrannical minority can be constrained by its own numerical weakness, but a democratic majority can do what it likes - and it does!

[*] In fact, Parliament has enacted such a decree in the guise, first, of the Abortion Act of 1967 and, very recently, of the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Bill. The latter "allows" abortion until and during birth in a wide range of cases of suspected "serious" handicap. In the view of some doctors this can include harelip or cleft palate. Laws designed to "allow" acts previously criminal are an abomination. Abortion at whatever stage is still murder and should be dealt with as such - Editor.

TAKING A LIBER(IA)TY

LIBERIAN government troops recently broke into the U.N. compound in Monrovia and massacred a number of people who had sought refuge there. The troops were identified as belonging to the Krahn tribe, as does the President; the refugees were members of the Gio and Mano tribes. There is a revolution going on in Liberia, which accounts for the trouble. Now suppose that South African troops broke into a U.N. compound and killed a number of people. Imagine the outcries, the indignation, the demands for immediate revenge; think of the T.V. programmes shown daily, the uproar in the Commons, and the baying of bishops. Fortunately for the blood pressure of our liberal-minded rulers it was an entirely African affair and can be quietly forgotten. Sometimes we wonder whether there may not be a trace of hypocrisy in the world today.

C U T A N D T H R U S T

by Marie Endean

BLATANT LYING INCORPORATED - Of all the whoppers told by the Fayed brothers to mislead City pundits, merchant bankers and the D.T.I., their claim to have been brought up by English nannies was surely the shrewdest. Telling the truth has traditionally been at the heart of English nursery wisdom. And not only in the nursery.

"If he'll only turn out a brave, helpful truth-telling Englishman and a Christian, that's all I want," said Tom Brown's father. That, too, was all that Thomas Arnold, the most famous of all public school headmasters, wanted for his boys. For him in the proper education of youth, morality and duty took precedence over everything else. Imagine, then, his humiliation when it was disclosed by the press that he had unjustly given eighteen strokes of the cane to a boy falsely accused of telling a lie. In the ensuing uproar he was forced to apologise in front of the whole school, and in writing as well. But he pressed on and shouldered the shame. Thus a tradition was born.

FALSEHOOD ON THE MARCH - In our Orwellian age, perception of truth has become blurred to a frightening extent both here and abroad. The odious damned lie is boldly taking over in all walks of life in all countries. Don't laugh, but last year more than five hundred people were injured in Dhaka in Bangladesh when police opened fire on rioting students demanding the right to cheat in examinations!

We now know that the dictator Ceaucescu regularly had Romanian weather forecasts falsified in winter, generally raising temperatures by ten degrees to attract tourists. More deadly than this was his banning a Report of the Bucharest Institute of Virology which warned of an AIDS epidemic among young children, especially orphans. Not possible, he declared, as AIDS was a disease restricted to capitalist countries. Like all true Marxists, he never let truth get in his way.

OUR OWN LAW NOW IN MORTAL DANGER - Lest we in this country should feel superior and smug, let us lay bare our weakness and the great lie about to be enshrined in the law of the land: a shameful denial of the rights of genetic parents. There is before Parliament at the time of writing the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Bill giving rise to much debate on whether experiments on embryos should be permitted at any stage, and on whether there should be a reduction in the legal time for abortion. Less widely discussed are Clauses 26 and 27 of the Bill.

Clause 27 is verily a snare laid by Satan, the Father of Lies. Just consider: it lays down that when the host surrogate mother is married, the genetic father will not be allowed to apply for recognition as the legal father. If the surrogate mother's husband consents to implantation by donor, it is he, the non-biological father, who will be regarded as the real and legal father. Thus the child so endangered will not have the legal right to discover the identity of his or her father. However, just to tease the poor progeny, through records not open to the general public, they will have the legal right to find out whether they have been born through this method. Could there be a crueller deception leading to as yet unplumbed and devastating psychological problems?

PRIMACY OF THE BLOOD LINE - The urge to find one's long lost father or long lost mother is the stuff of many a novel and real life tragedy. As Lord Teviot said in the Lords debate, "Every adult has a fundamental right to information about his genetic parents." The Chiefs of Scottish Clans naturally raised objections to Clause 27 in the debate on 13th February. Lady Saltoun of Abernethy moved amendments declaring, "If the Chief himself is a fraud and not of the blood, it makes a nonsense of the [clan] system." In the wider context, it also makes a nonsense of the family.

These amendments to preclude the danger of incest and to make sure that hereditary titles go to the right person were defeated by a Government majority of 62. The Government, however, promised to move its own amendment to take account of the Scottish chiefs' fears. Given the whole tenor of this Bill, any such amendment is certain to dice with the truth. The legal rights of genetic mothers are in a right mess, too. Unless Clause 26 is changed, the surrogate mother - more accurately described as the host mother, womb nurse or human incubator - is to be recognised as the child's "real" mother. A patent absurdity.

A TEST CASE - There is now before the courts a case where a genetic mother, herself born without a womb, has had her ovaries implanted in a willing surrogate. This biological mother and her husband are proud parents of twins born this way, but their troubles are only just beginning. Clause 26 does not recognise motherhood as fundamentally genetic, so only the surrogate mother will have legal right to the children. Thus the Clause perpetuates a definition of motherhood which is years out of date and which "flies in the face of present genetic knowledge and medical technology."

If it is passed in its present form, genetic parents will fail in their claim to their own children. They might just be granted custody or guardianship of technically illegitimate offspring. In our brave new world, it is indeed a wise child that knows its own father and/or mother!

CROWD CONTROL MACHINE USED TO HURL STONES

"SIR - Last week in Gaza I saw a stone-throwing machine. It was mounted on a heavy-duty chassis, it had a hopper and a catapult and throws stones at children. I had been sent to Jerusalem and Gaza by the National Union of Journalists to teach a course in journalism for members of the Arab Journalists Association under the auspices of the International Federation of Journalists. The stone-throwing machine was one of several weapons, including bouncing tear-gas bombs and plastic-covered roundshot, used by the military government against unarmed civilians. In my profession as a journalist and lecturer to young journalists I try to be objective and unbiased, but I cannot help wondering what kind of people could imagine, let alone construct, such a machine."

HENRY CLOTHIER, London EC1 [**Daily Telegraph**, 16/6/90]

Read **CHOICE** - Lady Birdwood's newspaper that opposes multi-racialism and one-worldism. S.a.e. to 31 Eastvale, Acton Vale, London W3.

Read **SPEARHEAD** - edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 80p from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

THE MANDELA MYTH

James Gibb Stuart looks at the reality behind the rehetoric

What are the factors in the South African situation that are being either hyped up, played down or studiously ignored? In February of this year we had the release of Nelson Mandela after more than twenty-five years imprisonment for terrorist offences and the plotting of armed revolution. That was an event which did not go without notice. The Press of the entire Western World sat at his feet, hanging on his every word; while the Anti-Apartheid Movement and the humanist element within the churches treated the affair so reverently that it might have been the Second Coming of Christ.

A simplistic view in those euphoric days was that after a few formalities, the former revolutionary would take over as President of a new South Africa, and decades of oppression and discrimination would vanish in a twinkling as all the country's many races entered a Golden Age of tolerance and enlightenment.

Such dangerous misconceptions about the realities of Africa cannot be dismissed as ignorance or naivety. People who write and control newspapers, and produce radio and television programmes, have ready access to jet travel, and can anyhow pay for accurate on-the-spot information. So when fairytale scenarios are being projected by media sophisticates for the sensitive tip of the world's most strategic continent, it's time to peer beyond the bright lights and the tinsel, and look for the aspects they omit to mention.

One such subject is money. Yet it takes big, big money to organise a social and political revolution in the style that has long been planned for the South African Republic. Much more money than could ever be gathered from a weekly round of church bazaars and coffee mornings! As an indication, in September 1985 Joe Slovo, brilliant KGB agent who controls the South African Communist Party (and as many believe, carries a power of attorney within the African National Congress) was in Vienna to collect a cheque for 10 million US dollars. In October, less than two months later, he had the satisfaction of knowing that a further \$5 million had been contributed, of

which \$2 million were to be expended on the South African Council of Churches.

Who produces that kind of money? Anti-Apartheid societies? Philanthropic socialist millionaires? Oxfam? Christian Aid? UNESCO?

In fact the funding for the ongoing revolution in Southern Africa is on such a scale that it could not possibly be afforded by any charity, or even a consortium of charities. Neither could it have been contributed by Soviet Russia, which in matters of terror and subversion was always ready to put up the military hardware, but never possessed the hard currency credits for cash handouts to its surrogates in the West. That, as Western intelligence services have long been aware, was the privilege and the prerogative of the international megabanks centred on New York. (Slovo's \$10 million windfall in 1985 was, for instance, drawn on the Chase Manhattan Bank of the USA for clearing through their South African channels to the ANC.)

Those who manage to close their minds to tyrannies, oppression, mass impoverishment and deprivation anywhere else on Earth, and have long been persuaded that denial of social integration and full political rights to South Africa's blacks is the major excrescence on the fair face of all humanity, are no doubt gratified to have the moguls of international finance so solidly behind them. They might even impute a moral motive, on the basis that big banking was looking to its image, and might want to be seen as the flagbearer for Western democratic values.

Others, less ideological and more realistic, must ask the nagging question: What's in it for them? When bankers create large sums of money, which they admittedly do without much cost to themselves, it is normally done on demand from a borrower, and in the expectation that it will earn the going rate of interest. Their philanthropy might extend to sponsoring sports events, or donating a new kidney machine to the local hospital. But the multi-million dollar funding for subversion and political change in Southern Africa just has to be seen as a policy investment that will pay off in the foreseeable future.

Does it seem far-fetched that sober pinstriped Wall Street financiers should be seen as fomentors of terror and subversion, with a leaning towards Marxist dictatorship in the states they have targeted? It was, after all, a previous generation of those same Wall Street bankers who provided the credits and the technology that made a super-power out of the Soviet Union. The facts are not in dispute. They were amply and convincingly documented by the American academic Antony C. Sutton in his "National Suicide" of 1973. It is just that, after publication, those facts came within the ambit of the studiously ignored.

So policy has decreed – high-level policy worked out at polished boardroom tables in the banking sanctums of Europe and America, that the existing power structure in South Africa, currently sustained by white and coloured electorates, should be rapidly eroded and replaced by a 'black majority government' nominally presided over by Nelson Mandela and dominated by the ANC. (Hence creation of the Mandela myth, and assertion by media-hype that the rag-taggle revolutionaries of the African National Congress are the only legitimate representatives of black South Africans.)

Again it begs the question: Are the Afrikaners so evil, have they evolved a system of such monstrous injustice and inequality that it must be expunged at all costs, and no matter what is put in its place? That may be the conviction of "bleeding heart" liberals in the safety of the West, but is it

also the sentiment of Africans themselves? Unlike the old repressive regimes of Communist Eastern Europe, where searchlights, watch towers and machine-gunning guards were employed to keep the enslaved peoples from getting out, South Africa's border problem through all the years of apartheid has been to stop hundreds of thousands of enthusiastic would-be immigrants from getting in. Voting with their feet! Are they trying to tell us something?

A crucial factor in the African equation that has always been discreetly played down is the overweening presence of the multinationals, those vast internationalised trading corporations with assets greater than many a nation state, and influence that reaches world-wide into the top echelons of government. One such sprawling conglomerate is the Lonrho Company (short for London-Rhodesia), which grew like a mushroom in the sixties and seventies, and whose chief executive in its rise to prominence has been the swashbuckling adventurer known to the City as 'Tiny' Rowland.

Some interesting disclosures have been made about Mr. Rowland in recent years: that he was born Roland Walter Fuhrhop, that he is of German extraction, and was dishonourably discharged from the British army for his enemy sympathies in 1942; that he has been investigated for fraud and other criminal activities more than once, but enjoys a mysterious high-level protection that enables him to walk free, and in sole command of his industrial kingdom, where lesser men would have suffered ignominy and ruin.

Rowland has long been involved in the muddy politics of emergent Africa. He paid tribute and subsidy to all the warring factions in Rhodesia, and gained handsome concessions for his company when the Marxists took control of the new Zimbabwe under Mugabe. He helped Marxist Sam Nujoma into power in Namibia, where he now has ambitious and well-sponsored plans for infrastructural development. He runs a 100,000 acre food and cotton producing estate in war-torn Mozambique, guarded by Marxist Frelimo troops who have been armed and trained

by the British SAS.

With that track record, it is safe to say that the Lonrho agricultural, industrial and mining conglomerate would have much to gain if a Marxist orientated ANC government took over in South Africa. To that end the astute Mr. Rowland has been taking good care of the ANC's top men in their years of privation and exile. For instance, when its President Oliver Tambo had to fly urgently from London to Sweden for medical treatment, the flight booking was made by the Lonrho Company, who also picked up the tab for the hotel expenses.

Then in the early months of 1990, when the South Africa Government started unbanning the various proscribed radical organisations, it was to Lonrho that the ANC turned for funds with which to set themselves up politically. The story has it that Rowland has already allocated 20 million Rand to buy them a block of offices in Diagonal Street, Johannesburg. This is much too large a sum to be explained by sheer philanthropy. For such largesse there is undoubtedly a price to be paid, and that will be exacted in full if the Mandela myth is self-fulfilling, and the revolutionaries take over in Pretoria.

To the cynically-minded that might not mean much, unless they know a little about Rowland's reputation as a ruthless exploiter. In 1987, for instance, the Anti-Slavery Society published a scathing indictment of Lonrho's labour policy in the Ashanti Goldmines, where teenage boys were made to work half-naked in cyanide pits, with the poisonous fumes seeping into their bodies.

Thus the unacceptable face of capitalism and the faceless gnomery of bankerism have a common purpose in pursuing the *revolutionary* as opposed to the *evolutionary* solution for the South African imbroglio. The reason for this is that evolution takes time, whilst revolution you can have tomorrow. Why then the indecent haste?

Just this, that there's been an ongoing crisis in the American financial system since banking deregulation, the default on Third World Debt and the years of escalating budget deficits. Volcker's high interest rate binge destroyed the savings &

loan industry, which now requires multibillion dollar bailouts. Small regional banks are failing every year, only to be "rescued" by their internationalised Big Brothers, who are themselves basket cases held together by the Federal Reserve Bank. Massive pressures and manipulations are exerted on a daily basis to keep the Treasury long bond floating, when straight market rationale should have sunk it long ago. Economic traditionalists, reading the data, have forecast collapses in 1986, 1987, 1989 and continuing into the nineties. Many of them have been retired by their editors, sadder and wiser, as the convolutions and the manipulations go on despite them, and the system maintains its gravity defying momentum.

Logically there has to come a time when the credit spree ends, and the debt pyramid implodes into its crumbling foundations. Meanwhile the major international players are desperately seeking to trade debt paper for equity. One thing they have decided is that somehow they have to keep the game going until they can get complete control over the tremendous physical resources of South Africa. (In 1987 a British analyst declared that "South Africa possesses precious metals worth more than the joint assets of the entire Western banking system, and without which Western commerce and defence would be stifled and ruined".)

The financiers and international businessmen have appreciated this from the beginning, and in their experienced opinion, control can best be exercised through Marxist one-party black government. They know already how it works. Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe is one of their favourite sons. His minerals-rich country is being exploited by the multinationals on a scale that would never have been allowed in the days of Ian Smith.

Therein lies the background to the Mandela myth, which must be sustained by media hype and multi-million dollar funding, and mass bribery and coercion of South African officialdom, until the ex-con. from Robben Island can be offered up as first President of a black Azania.

And while those conspirators play their nasty, corrupt and treacherous games, this major Southern African state, an entire sub-continent's industrial, technological and mineral power house, is kept in a continuing state of suspense and trepidation. Tribal nations such as the Zulus, the Sothos, the Pondos, the Tswanas – and not forgetting the white nation – resent the arrogant overplay on the Xhosa-dominated ANC, and make their own dispositions. They sense that if the Rowlands and the Oppenheimers, the Kissingers and the Rockefellers get their way, it

will result in a tyranny just as gripping and as long-lasting as anything that befell post-war Eastern Europe. Joe Slovo, that old hardline Stalinist, might not even bid for political office, but it would be his strategy and his philosophy that would predominate for as long as the bankers needed him.

Should all this happen – should emotively involved but factually deprived Western peoples just stand idly by and allow it to happen – can any of them expect a better fate if in time they too are considered expendable?

Reprinted with acknowledgement to the Western Goals Institute, BCM Box 9045, London WC1N 3XX. Founded by the murdered American patriot, Congressman Larry McDonald, Western Goals defines its values as "based on the maintenance of the rule of law under constitutional government, recognition and protection for the rich cultural diversity of Western nations within a framework of international friendship and co-operation; the family as the essential bedrock of any decent society; and the maximum degree of freedom of thought and action which is compatible with an ordered society."

DISCRETION AT SOUTH AFRICA HOUSE

I DON'T know if readers are aware of a booklet issued free by the South African Embassy titled **A.N.C. – A Soviet Task Force**. I am now told by the Embassy that this booklet, or any other literature exposing the A.N.C., is no longer available. On being told this I commented, "Obviously now that the present South African Government is conversing with the A.N.C., they don't wish to continue to show these terrorists in their true light." The official simply replied, "Quite." We can all guess who is behind this skulduggery and betrayal. If the A.N.C. was a Soviet Task Force before Mandela's release, then it still is. So why has De Clerk prevailed on his diplomatic staff in London to have it treated as otherwise? Unless De Clerk and the A.N.C. are now linked together under the same management – that of Harry Oppenheimer.

JOHN HILL

MANDELA'S E.C. BUCKET-SHOP

FETED by the Euro-Parliament in Strasbourg, Nelson Mandela asked for "buckets of money" from the E.C. to help the A.N.C. "contribute fully to a negotiated settlement in South Africa," according to **The Independent** of 14th June. Now that appeal was interesting. South Africa with apartheid costs the U.K. (and E.C.) taxpayers nothing. South Africa without apartheid will cost the U.K. (and E.C.) taxpayers billions. So it would seem to make sense that South Africa with apartheid would be a better deal, but in the end, of course, everyone will opt for a Mandela or Tutu-led regime. Have White people lost all their sense nowadays?

CANDOUR NEEDS MORE SUBSCRIBERS! HAVE YOU SECURED ONE YET?

THE MEANING OF TREASON - ACCORDING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT

THERE is a noticeable similarity between immigration into Britain and entry into Europe. At first nothing is said (officially). Then, when disquiet is felt, there are soothing words: there are not many immigrants, we shan't be affected by the Continent. Then, a more positive approach: we shall benefit by having these workers in our factories and shops or by increasing trade with Europe. Then the fait accompli: we can't do anything about it, we are being swept along on the tide of history. Finally, the law. Objection to immigration is racism and a crime, which can be punished. Objection to loss of sovereignty is "treason" to Brussels and will no doubt be punishable in some manner.

The latest patriot to have been pounced on in regard to the above final point is Ken McKilliam. He was visited by police on 28th June, who took away a large quantity of his papers. Mr McKilliam tells us he had been expecting a visitation ever since he publicised his charge of high treason against Brittan, Heath and Whitelaw. To be fair to the officer in charge of the raid, he did tell Mr McKilliam he would prefer to get on with what he believed he was employed to do - i.e. catch thieves.

BRITISH ACHIEVEMENT IN UGANDA

"SIR - In her article about Uganda, Catherine Bond says that the author of an article in a Leftist newspaper expresses the current viewpoint in affecting surprise that 'he even has a kind word to say about colonialism'. Guilt and prejudice about colonialism is widespread, especially among BBC and ITV correspondents. But Uganda was given by Britain all the infrastructure of a modern state: law and order, central and local government, hospitals, dispensaries, schools, a university, roads, railways. When we left, it was in a flourishing condition, with every prospect of a successful future. As the sole European accompanying the Ugandan Minister of Regional Administration round every district council in Uganda after Independence in 1962, I discovered that the people bore not the slightest hint of resentment to 'colonialism'. Can we please have fewer lies in the media about colonial exploitation, and more recognition of what was one of Britain's greatest contributions to world history?"

A.C. BADENOCH [Daily Telegraph, 24/5/90]

MRS DORIS CHESTERTON - It is with the deepest regret that we record the death of Doris Lucy Chesterton, widow of our founder A.K. Chesterton, on 31st May, 1990. May her soul rest in peace.

NEW FROM CANDOUR TAPES - Father Charles Coughlin was known as America's "Radio Priest" for his powerful speeches attacking the Money Power. Hear two such broadcasts from 1937 on a new C60 cassette called FR COUGHLIN ON THE AIR. Only £4 from CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £6.00 OVERSEAS £9.00 AIRMAIL U.S. \$20 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. [Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]